

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 227

CS 204 061

AUTHOR Greenberg, Bradley S.; McDermott, Steven T.
TITLE The Debut of a Black Television Station: Adoption of an Innovation.
PUB DATE Aug 77
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (60th, Madison, Wisconsin, August 21-24, 1978)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audiences; *Black Community; *Blacks; *Broadcast Television; Diffusion; *Information Dissemination; Mass Media; Television Research; Television Surveys; Television Viewing

ABSTRACT

One of Detroit's two black-owned and -operated television stations began broadcasting in October, 1975, as an independent, nonnetwork-affiliated channel. The diffusion theory of Rogers and Shoemaker, which assumes that adoption of an innovation is affected by the potential adopter's perception of the innovation's attributes, was applied in a two-wave telephone survey to evaluate the station's effectiveness in reaching the black audience. Phase one, a systematic random sample of all Detroit telephone numbers, and phase two, calls only to blacks, consisted of telephone interviews where questions were structured according to the diffusion theory's five attributes necessary for adoption of an innovation: trialability, complexity, observability, compatibility, and advantages. The findings reveal that the diffusion model worked for black Americans in ways similar to previous studies on whites, that the black minority group is more dependent on interpersonal sources of information than is the more dominant group, and that by the second collection of data, regular viewing of the black television station had decreased considerably. (MAI)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE DEBUT OF A BLACK TELEVISION STATION:
ADOPTION OF AN INNOVATION

By

Bradley S. Greenberg and Steven T. McDermott*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bradley S. Greenberg

Steven T. McDermott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Department of Communication
Michigan State University

Paper presented to the Minorities and Communication Division,
Association for Education in Journalism Convention, Madison,
Wisconsin, August 1977.

*Dr. Greenberg is Professor of Communication and Telecommunication at Michigan State University. Mr. McDermott is a doctoral student in Communication and will be joining the faculty at San Jose State University this fall. The authors are particularly grateful for project assistance by Mr. Ralph Abbott, a doctoral student at Michigan State University.

ED153227

CS224061

THE DEBUT OF A BLACK TELEVISION STATION: ADOPTION OF AN INNOVATION

By Bradley S. Greenberg and Steven T. McDermott

Very few black owned and operated television stations exist in the United States. As of 1975, only two could be clearly identified from among the 1,000 commercial stations in the U.S.¹ Yet, black viewers constitute a significant segment of viewers, typically watch more television than do whites, and typically are heavier viewers of those programs which feature major black performers.²

In October, 1975, one of the two black owned and operated television stations began broadcasting in Detroit as an independent, non-network affiliated channel. Channel 62 presented a potpourri of both syndicated entertainment programs with whites as major characters (e.g., "Get Smart," "Rawhide") and shows with blacks as major characters (e.g., "I Spy"). In addition, the station had exclusively black news reporters and personnel, black oriented religious programs, black hosted and oriented talk shows, and local entertainment and community programs designed for and run by blacks (e.g., "Morning Party," "The Scene"). The station's local advertising contained very heavy use of black actors and actresses and was designed to appeal to the black community.

Considering the goals of this station and the opportunity to examine public response to the station since it first began its broadcast schedule, the present study was designed. Primarily, there was an interest in the extent of

viewership, the composition of the audience of early users, means of public awareness about the station, and the community's attitudes toward the station. Further, the opportunity to study changes in these behaviors over time provided an additional central interest. As a result, a two-wave telephone survey was designed, with the first data collection during the first weeks of the station's broadcasting existence, and the second five months later.

In the absence of previous specific research in this area, it seemed reasonable to adapt the diffusion theory work of Rogers and Shoemaker.³ There, the issue is the adoption of innovations; acceptance of the black oriented television station became the innovation whose diffusion and adaption (usage) were examined.

That theory stipulates a period during which target receivers have an opportunity to become aware of the existence of an innovation, and this became a critical initial variable.

Clearly, it should be an antecedent condition that:

H1. Those who are more aware and earlier aware of an innovation are more likely to adopt it, i.e., become regular viewers in this case.

Further, it is most likely that this event would be of far greater social interest in the black community than in the white--the rarity of a major station owned, operated and staffed by blacks. Given this impetus, it was reasoned that both the interpersonal networks and personal interest of black citizens should contribute to more rapid diffusion of information about the station. It was hypothesized that:

H1a. Blacks will be earlier aware and more aware of the station's existence.

However, awareness by itself has not been conceptualized as an adequate

predictor of adoption of innovations. It is an early and necessary, but insufficient, condition.

Central to the theory advanced by Rogers and Shoemaker is that the adoption of an innovation is affected by the potential adopter's perceptions of the innovation's attributes or characteristics. Specifically, they argue that five main attributes are necessary for adoption.⁴

One of these is trialability, or whether the potential adopters have had the opportunity and taken the opportunity to experiment with the innovation. Those aware should be more likely to engage in such trials. Experimentation with a television station could include such behaviors as trying to find the station on the television set, and watching part or all of some shows not available elsewhere. The simple argument is that those who make attempts at trying the station are more likely to become regular users (adopters), given any satisfaction. Given the expectation that black viewers would tend to be more interested and pleased with this station's special offerings, it was hypothesized that:

H2. Those making trials would more likely become regular viewers, and

H2a. Blacks will demonstrate greater frequency of trials of the innovations than whites.

A second innovation attribute is the observability of the innovation. Can it be seen as others try it or adopt it? The diffusion literature focuses on such innovations as hybrid corn, where one farmer can see that an adopting farmer's corn yield is larger than his. For the present study, observability could be conceived of as one citizen watching another view the station, and seeing that the other person is satisfied. Such direct observation opportunities are unlikely. However, it seems reasonable to make the juxtaposition that one person can talk with another about the station and its programming, and that such

opportunities could be somewhat frequent. Given this rationale, it was hypothesized that:

- H3. Those who talked with others more often about the new station would more likely become regular viewers.

Further, given whites and blacks equally aware of the station's newness or recency, blacks should more likely share with their same-race peers information about the station, upcoming programs of special interest to the black community, etc. So, the follow-up hypothesis was:

- H3a. Blacks would more likely talk with others about the station than would whites.

The third criterion is perceived complexity of the innovation. If an innovation is perceived as more complex, the Rogers and Shoemaker model indicates that adoption is less likely. What can be meant by complexity in adopting a TV station? For one, there must be access to television. One cannot anticipate this as a genuine problem, given greater than 90% television set penetration in both black and white homes, as far back as seven years ago.⁵ More realistically, UHF channels have a traditional problem of viewers believing they have reception problems, or actually having them. Again, the overall hypothesis is straightforward:

- H4. Those who perceive limited or no access to the innovation are less likely to become regular viewers.

Arguing that such complexity would differ by the race of the viewer is less straightforward. At the least, it is possible that more whites would 'claim' to have difficulties obtaining a station that is the highest number (62) in their local market. For purposes of testing this notion of possible bias, it was hypothesized:

- H4a. Blacks are more likely to indicate the availability of access to the new station than whites.

Fourth is the perceived compatibility of the innovation to the potential advertiser's existing values, prior perceptions and needs. Given that regular black performers are rare on network affiliated commercial television stations, this station would be providing a central emphasis on black-oriented and created programming and would be attempting to service the potential perceived need in the black community for programming in their personal interests. All these yield a basis for these hypotheses:

H5. The more an innovation is judged to be compatible with perceived needs, the more likely viewing will occur, and,

H5a. Blacks are more likely to judge the innovation as compatible with their needs than are whites.

The final innovation attribute to be examined is the perceived advantages of the innovator. Does the proposed innovation provide something not otherwise available and desired? In this case, the station was promoting itself as an addition to the community, as an opportunity for nearly half the citizens in the community to avail themselves of television programming specifically bought and/or created for them. Would it be offering something different? Would it be offering something that would benefit the community-at-large? The major conceptual difference between the attribute of advantages and the attribute of compatibility was the consideration of advantages as a larger system attribute, rather than as the personal benefit to an individual. The general hypothesis was:

H6. Those who consider the innovation as more advantageous are more likely to become regular viewers.

Nevertheless this innovation was deliberately appealing to a special subgroup of that community, the black near-majority. They should be even more susceptible to believing that this innovation would be advantageous for all, as well as for themselves:

H6a. Blacks are more likely to consider the new television station advantageous to the community than are whites.

As indicated, the study data were collected at two points in time, some five months apart. No over-time hypotheses were constructed; neither theory nor prior empirical evidence could suggest a sound basis for prediction. One could have suggested a novelty effect would be found, but for whom? Blacks could have gone more readily to the station initially because it was novel for them to be able to view so many other blacks. Then their support might have dissipated after some time. Whites could have been overly curious as the station began broadcasting, and gone to the station to satisfy that curiosity. They also could have been expected to drift away. When the data relevant to the established hypotheses are presented, across-time comparisons will be made for what additional information they may suggest.

METHODS

A two-wave telephone survey was conducted of phones within metropolitan Detroit, Michigan, the main target area for Channel 62 broadcasting. The area population was 1,511,482 according to the Detroit 1970 census. To assure more equivalent representation of blacks and whites in the sample, two data-collection phases were subsumed in each wave of interviewing, and will be described below. The first wave of interviewing started a week after the Channel 62 full schedule of programming was first broadcast. The interviews in wave 1 for phase 1 took place October 20-November 7, and for phase 2, December 8-December 31, 1975. The second wave started with phase 1 April 5-20, 1976 and ended with phase 2, from May 17-28, 1976. Interviewers were trained undergraduate students, comprised of equal numbers of men and women and blacks and whites. All phase 1 calls were made in the afternoon (3-6 p.m.) and evenings (7-10 p.m.). Phase 2 calls were made in the evening only.

Sample

For each sampling phase, a systematic random sample selection of telephone numbers was made from the metropolitan Detroit phone directory issued in September, 1975. In the first phase of each wave, all answering homes were interviewed regardless of demographic characteristics; a race question was near the end of the schedule. In the second phases, only blacks were interviewed; a race question was asked after a few lead-in questions. This elaborated interviewing and sampling procedure resulted in the minimum criterion of 100 black respondents for each wave of the survey. Furthermore, the number of black respondents in each phase adequately reflected the census distribution of telephones for blacks: 14% of the completions were black respondents at wave 1, phase 1; 15% at wave 1, phase 2; 13% at wave 2, phase 1; and 15% at wave 2, phase 2.

The completion rates can be described as follow: In phase 1 of wave 1, the total sample was 456 phones, 49 of which were determined to be disconnected numbers. Of the remainder, 63% yielded completed interviews. In phase 1 of wave 2, the effective completion rate was 69%, of 429 phones. The remainder for each phase was divided between telephones for which no answer was obtained after three callbacks (14%) and refusals (14%).

In phase 2 of each wave, similar sampling results were obtained for the completed interviews among black respondents.

Further, demographic analyses between phases indicated no differences in respondent characteristics for sex, race, or age distributions.

By race, the basic analyses contain 193 white and 140 black respondents in wave 1, and 199 whites and 131 black respondents in wave 2.

Demographic differences did appear between the two waves. For both the black and white respondents, at wave 2, there were more women, lower education representation and older sub-groups than at wave 1. However, this occurred

equivalently for both racial groups. Because the basic analyses focus on within wave comparisons, the sample differences between waves are of little import. Further, no demographic variables other than race were related to adoption.

Variables

Operationalizations were created for each of the major variables in the proposed model of station acceptance or adoption.

Awareness. A precursor to most station-related behaviors was whether or not the respondent was aware the station existed. Each respondent was asked whether they had heard, "...anything about a new TV station starting in Detroit...?" If they had heard, they were questioned further in terms of from what sources they had heard, including television, radio, newspaper, mail, or somebody.

Trialability. Two measures assessed trials with the station. First, respondents were asked if they had tried to get the station. If so, they were queried as to whether they had watched any shows on this station.

Observability. Respondents were asked whether they had talked with anyone about the station.

Complexity. The difficulties in using the station were measured in terms of both set and channel availability. Whether a TV set was available was asked. Anticipating relatively constant responses to this question, three questions dealt with channel availability. Respondents were asked what channels they could get. Scored were whether they mentioned any UHF numbers, and whether they mentioned Channel 62 specifically. Later, respondents who had heard of the station were specifically asked if they thought they could get it on their TV set.

Compatibility. This concept was operationalized in terms of perceived personal import to the respondent. Each was asked how important the station was to them, personally, with response options ranging from "very important" to "not important at all." The sub-set who had watched any shows were asked, if

they would "...miss anything if this channel went out of business," but only at wave 2.

Advantages. This concept was operationalized in terms of perceived need in the community for this station. Respondents were asked if "...Detroit needs this new station," with yes/no response options. Further, they were asked, "How much do you think black people are watching this station?" and "How much do you think white people are watching this station?" with response options ranging from "a lot" to "not at all."

The fundamental difference between these last two concepts is their relative orientation to self-need, and to system need.

Adoption. In this case, adoption would consist of increasing dependence on this station for television viewing which might earlier have been given to other available stations. All respondents were asked, "What channels do you watch most?" and "How often are you watching shows on this new station?" For the former, spontaneously citing Channel 62 was the key response used to identify strong adopters. For the last, five response options ranged from "never" to "several times a day."

RESULTS

The presentation of results will proceed in the order in which the hypotheses were developed.

Awareness. The first hypothesis dealt with awareness of existence of the new television station. At the time the first data were collected, 47% of all respondents had heard of the new television station; at wave two, the proportion who indicated they knew of the new television station which had started up the prior fall was 50%. Diffusion of awareness did not change.

Generally, viewers found out about the station through three sources:

television, newspapers, and through communication with others. Approximately 20% heard about it from either newspapers or television, and 15% found out through communication with others. These proportions were the same at both waves. Blacks and whites differed in their use of two sources of information. Twenty-nine percent of the blacks heard about it from television, compared to 14% of the whites. An even more substantial difference occurred in use of interpersonal sources. Twenty-nine percent of the blacks heard about Channel 62 from others while only 4% of the whites heard from others.

Table 1 provides a basic test of the awareness hypothesis. Adoption as measured was significantly related to awareness at both time periods. Those who had heard of the station were more likely to spontaneously cite the channel as among those which they most watched, and were more likely to have greater regularity of watching the channel on a weekly and daily basis.

Between wave 1 and wave 2, there was considerable slippage in regularity of viewing the station by both those who were more and less aware of it. The relationship between awareness and these measures of adoption persisted at lower viewing levels.

The second awareness hypothesis predicted stronger awareness among blacks than among whites and this was clearly confirmed, at both time periods. At wave 1, approximately three-fourths of the black respondents compared with 39% of the white respondents had heard of the new television station. By wave 2, the data obtained among the whites remained fairly constant, while there was slippage in awareness among the black segment of the community.

Table 1 About Here

From this, the analyses moved to the five attributes of innovations which had been predicted to be related to adoption.

Trialability. Table 2 presents the results obtained with two measures of innovation adoption trials. Those who had heard of the station were asked if they had tried to get the channel. At both time periods more of those who had tried were likely to cite the channel as a "most watched" channel. Furthermore, those who had tried to get the station were also more likely to indicate that they were now regular viewers of programs broadcast on that channel. For example, at wave 2 among those who had tried to get the station, 16% never watched any shows; among those who hadn't tried to get the station, 80% never watched any programs on that channel.

Table 2 About Here

The second measure of trialability was whether they had watched any shows. During the first wave, all the findings were in the predicted direction but did not achieve appropriate levels of significance. Many were now trying the innovation, but the sorting out of adopters and non-adopters apparently held more firmly during wave 2. Then, having watched some program on the station in the past was highly related to the regularity of current viewing. Of those who had watched some show in the past, 5% now reported that they were not watching the station at all compared with 62% who were watching it regularly; of those who said they hadn't watched any show in the recent past, 55% said they were watching none now, compared with 19% who were regular viewers.

Attempts to get the channel support the trialability hypothesis. Less clear are the results related to recent watching of programs on the channel.

Racial differences in trials, as hypothesized, are strongly confirmed in Table 2a. Blacks were more likely to try the station in both time periods, and were far more likely to have sampled from the station's offerings. At time 1, during the initial days of the channel's broadcasting existence, 84% of the black citizens had watched the station compared with 58% of the whites.

Observability. Here, the working measure was the extent to which talking with others about the new station was related to adoption. At wave 1, when there was maximum community interest in the opening of the station, 46% of those who had heard about the station had talked with others, and at wave 2, 33% had talked with others. Relevant data for testing the hypotheses are in Table 3.

Table 3 About Here

At the first time period, 23% of those who had talked with others cited the station as one of their favorite compared with 6% of those who had not talked with others. At wave 2, the directional difference remained but its magnitude lessened.

The second measure of adoption, regularity of current viewing of the station was related to the observability measure moreso at Time 2 than at Time 1. During the later data collection, 67% of those who had talked with others were regular viewers, compared with 29% of those who had not. Two of the four statistical tests were significant in the predicted direction while the other two provided confirmatory evidence in the same direction.

Racial differences are in Table 3a. Black citizens were significantly more likely to talk about this new station than were white citizens in both data collection periods. At wave 1 for example, 61% of the blacks had talked with others, compared with 24% of whites.

Complexity. Of the four measures of complexity that were developed two were abandoned when marginal distributions on those variables were computed. One was whether there was a television set in the home. Only four of the more than 550 homes did not have television sets so this provided no inhibitor to adoption of the innovation. A second variable was a pointed question which asked all respondents if they thought they could get Channel 62. When asked

that specifically, nearly 90% said yes, and this distribution was judged as too invariant for analysis.

Earlier in the interview, the respondents were asked an open-ended question, to identify the channel numbers they could get on their TV sets. This response was coded in two fashions, whether they cited any numbers indicative of UHF channel numbers, and whether or not they cited Channel 62 specifically. Table 4 presents the results of analyses for these two variables.

Table 4 About Here

The issue of any channels in the UHF band did not differentiate adoption from non-adoption. Clearly, current viewing of the station is related marginally to the citation of UHF channel numbers. But the tabled data indicate that the early recognition of Channel 62 is a far more sensitive predictor of early and later adoption. In all four analyses of the subgroups which did or did not cite Channel 62 as specifically available to them, there are clear and strong relationships with both adoption variables ($p < .001$).

Similarly, Table 4a demonstrates racial differences in the second of the complexity measures. That is, blacks and whites are equally likely to cite UHF channels as available on the television sets, but it is primarily the black respondents who specifically identified Channel 62 as one of those available UHF channels ($p < .001$).

The complexity of the innovation then is not deterred by technological complexity. Both adopters and non-adopters own television sets, think that they can get any channel number when specifically prompted as to what that number would be, and all indicate equivalently the availability of UHF channels. Rather it is the selectivity of a particular channel which is already more attractive to one group than to another which remains as the long potential indicator of complexity.

Comptability. There were two measures of the perceived need for this station among citizens of Detroit. One asked to what extent it would be missed if it went out of business. This question was asked only during the second wave. Answers to that question were not related to whether that station was cited as most watched or not. However, missing the station was strongly related to regularity of watching that channel's programs ($\chi^2 = 14.9$, $df = 4$, $p < .005$). Among those who would miss the station, 65% watched the station several times each day or week, compared to 20% of those who said they would not miss the station.

Table 5 presents the adoption rates for those who held the station in varying degrees of personal importance.

Table 5 About Here

All analyses relating this index of comptability to adoption were statistically and strongly significant. Those for whom the channel was judged to be personally important were far more likely to have become regular viewers and to indicate that that channel was one which they watched most. During wave 1, among those for whom the channel was of high personal importance, 0% never watched and 30% had become regular viewers.

Table 5a presents supportive elements for the hypothesis that the station would be more important to blacks than to whites. These differences are highly significant. For only 6% of the blacks was the station low in personal import and for only 5% of the whites was it high.

Advantages. Table 6 presents a subset of the data which tested the advantages hypotheses. Detroiters who believe the community needed the station were more likely to be adopters of this innovation, although this evidence is stronger for wave 1 than wave 2 and is primarily related to the adoption variable which

tested frequency of current watching of the station. Among those who said yes at wave 1, the station was needed by the community, 6% were non-viewers and 65% were regular viewers; of those who said the station was not needed by the community 46% were non-viewers and 15% were very regular viewers. By wave 2, those who perceived a need did substantially less viewing, but those who perceived no need did virtually no viewing at all.

Two questions related to advantages were asked of respondents which are not in the top half of Table 6. These questions asked how much blacks would be watching the station and how much whites would be watching the station. The responses to neither of these questions were consistently related to the set of adoption measures.

Table 6 About Here

Table 6a reports racial differences among the advantage measures. The blacks were more likely to perceive a need in the community for the station than the whites, although the white rate for the perceived need was high as well. Blacks predicted that other blacks would be watching the station more than whites predicted black use of the station. Blacks were equally projective in predicting greater use of the station by white citizens than whites themselves forecast.

The hypothesis that perceived advantages would be related to adoption is partly confirmed in this study. Clearly the perceived need of the community is related to the current rate of adoption of the innovation, as translated into regularity of a station viewing. Predicted differences in perceived advantages by community subgroups was strongly confirmed. That subgroup most directly targeted by the creators of this innovation were far more likely to perceive a general community need which extended not only to them but to their expectations of non-targeted community subgroups.

Overall adoption. Two analyses conclude this section. The first presents the obvious--the relative rate of adoption of the station for the black and white citizens. The model presented argues that those for whom the attributes of the innovation are more positive are more likely to adopt. Having now demonstrated conclusively that the attributes persist more for blacks than for whites, Table 7 provides the capstone in this argument.

Table 7 About Here

For all adoption measures, at all time periods, blacks have become adopters more strongly than have whites. At both waves 1 and 2, 15% of the blacks and 2% of the whites spontaneously identified this station as among those channels "most watched." At wave 1, 82% of the blacks and 29% of the whites were frequent viewers; by wave 2, these proportions were 57% and 24% respectively. It was black viewers who were dropping off more rapidly.

The second analysis took indicators of the five innovation attributes and entered them in a pair-wise multiple regression analysis, using regularity of program viewing as the dependent variable. Each attribute was represented by at least one indicator variable. For all respondents, the multiple correlation of the five attributes with adoption was .685. Nearly 50% of the variance was parsimoniously accounted for in this model. Two variables--trialability and compatibility--obtained significant beta values. This analysis was repeated separately for the black and white respondent subgroups, and both multiple correlations were statistically significant.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Summary. Hypotheses were developed from the diffusion of innovation model as proposed by Rogers and Shoemaker (1971). The basic hypotheses reasoned that once awareness of an innovation had occurred, those who were made aware were likely to use a specific set of innovation attributes to aid them in their decision whether to adopt or not adopt the innovation. In the present study, the innovation concern was the establishment of a black owned, operated and oriented television station in Detroit. The major results were:

1. Awareness of the innovation was consistently related to its adoption. Those who had heard of the station were far more likely to become regular viewers. Black citizens were far more likely to have been aware of the new station than white citizens.
2. The trialability of the innovation was moderately related to its adoption rates. Those who tried to get this television channel were more likely to become adopters than those who hadn't made a specific attempt to try it. Blacks were far more likely to have engaged in trials than white viewers.
3. The attribute of observability, which in this instance was talking to others about the station, was moderately related to the measures of adoption. By the second data collection wave, having talked with others was strongly related to regularity of viewing. Black citizens were far more likely to have talked with others about the station than whites.
4. The attribute of complexity was of questionable importance as a predictor of adoption. First, virtually all but a handful of community respondents had television sets. Second, virtually all indicated that they thought they could get this specific channel number on their set.

Further, almost all cited the fact that some UHF channels were available to them. Only when respondents spontaneously mentioned their ability to get this particular channel was a relationship to adoption found. Then, the ability to get the channel was strongly related to all adoption measures. Blacks were far more likely to identify this channel as one which they could get.

5. Compatibility of the innovation with existing personal needs and values was strongly related to the measures of adoption. Those who perceived a higher personal need for the station were far more likely to adopt the innovation. Blacks were far more likely to perceive high personal importance in the innovation than were whites.
6. Perceived advantages of the innovation to the community were related to adoption of the innovation. Black citizens were far more likely to perceive a strong community need for this innovation. They also perceived that blacks and whites would do more watching of the station than did whites.

Discussion. One initial theoretic contribution of this study is that the diffusion model proposed appears to work for black Americans in much the same ways that dozens of prior studies have suggested it ought to be working for whites, for citizens in developing countries, etc.

The findings further indicate, as other studies have suggested, that this minority group, even when it constitutes a strong community plurality, is nevertheless more dependent on interpersonal sources of information for awareness than is the more dominant group. Of course, it is partially due to that greater dependency that the minority has called for more access to mass media--and this particular innovation serves that purpose directly. This station is particularly important to the minority group because it fills a communication void--persistent

and regular access to subgroup information, entertainment, etc.

From the diffusion theory view, what appears most intriguing is the comparability of results at both time periods. Although no differences by time wave were posited, nevertheless, we anticipated that the importance of the key variables would diminish over time. The innovation was a truly new thing at the first data collection period; it was then that most experimentation should occur, most perception of need, and most social discourse. While it is true that higher levels of these activities did occur, they were still occurring five months later, and were still found to be related to adoption in virtually the same fashion, across all attributes. The innovation process was not concluded it seems.

It is now appropriate for further research to determine the stations' efficacy. Is it serving well the community segment which most attends to it? Is there reliance on the station for sub-community news, information, and cultural activities? Do the attending citizens perceive that the station has a positive impact on the black community, on their self-images, etc? What is the relationship of the white community to the station? Is it advertising, promoting, watching and otherwise supportive of the facility? Are more positive black images now available and accepted? Has the early community enthusiasm been maintained or diminished?

The issue of dis-adoption remains an important one. By the second collection of data, regularity of viewing had decreased considerably, and non-viewers were a substantially larger proportion of the sample. Yet, the data analyses do not examine this closely. Most analyses were looking for relationships among variables, and not for parametric estimates of viewing levels which would be a strong commercial criterion. The possibility that the first wave of data were being collected during a 'high' period suggests an extended examination of

dis-adoption or disaffection with the innovation, over time. The station may have served primarily as a novelty, or failed to provide adequate program origination and differentiation, in competition with the dominating commercial networks. If so, that would have important implications with regard to increased minority access to public communication systems.

Table 1
Adoption At Two Time Periods By Awareness

Adoption	Wave 1		(p) ¹	Wave 2		(p)
	Aware (n=95)	Not Aware (n=106)		Aware (n=166)	Not Aware (n=170)	
1. Channel is among "most watched" ²	14%	1%	(<.001)	11%	3%	(<.006)
2. Regularity of watching: "never"	7%	25%	(<.001)	31%	64%	(<.001)
"several times per day/week"	63%	38%		43%	16%	

1a. Awareness By Race

Race						
1. Black	71%	29%	(<.001)	60%	40%	(<.005)
2. White	39%	61%		43%	57%	

¹P values for all tables are the result of χ^2 analyses of table frequencies. Those frequencies have been transformed into proportions in these tables for ease of interpretation. The channel "most watched" proportions were those who spontaneously cited Channel 62 when asked an open-ended question. Regularity of watching specifically asked about Channel 62. Five response categories were available and all were used in the statistical analysis. For presentational purposes, the tables summarize those data.

²For the adoption variables across the tables, read in this fashion: 14% of those aware of the station and 1% of those not aware at Wave 1 cited Channel 62 as a "most watched" channel.

Table 2

Adoption At Two Time Periods By Trialability

<u>Adoption</u>	<u>Tried to Get Channel</u>					
	<u>Wave 1</u>			<u>Wave 2</u>		
	<u>Tried</u> (n=80)	<u>Didn't</u> (n=32)	(p)	<u>Tried</u> (n=121)	<u>Didn't</u> (n=40)	(p)
1. Channel is among "most watched"	18%	2%	(<.01)	14%	3%	(<.09)
2. Regularity of watching: "never"	5%	9%	(<.09)	16%	80%	(<.003)
"several times per day/week"	70%	50%		54%	5%	

<u>Adoption</u>	<u>Watched Some Show</u>					
	<u>Watched</u> (n=56)	<u>Didn't</u> (n=22)	(p)	<u>Watched</u> (n=98)	<u>Didn't</u> (n=21)	(p)
1. Channel is among "most watched"	22%	8%	(n.s.)	16%	5%	(n.s.)
2. Regularity of watching: "never"	4%	18%	(n.s.)	5%	55%	(<.001)
"several times per day/week"	70%	60%		62%	19%	

2a. Trialability By Race

<u>Race</u>	<u>Tried</u>	<u>Didn't</u>		<u>Tried</u>	<u>Didn't</u>	
1. Black	77%	22%	(<.001)	87%	13%	(<.004)
2. White	49%	51%		65%	35%	
<u>Race</u>	<u>Watched</u>	<u>Didn't</u>		<u>Watched</u>	<u>Didn't</u>	
1. Black	84%	16%	(<.02)	92%	8%	(<.006)
2. White	58%	42%		70%	30%	

Table 3

Adoption At Two Time Periods By Observability:

Talking to Others

<u>Adoption</u>	<u>Wave 1</u>			<u>Wave 2</u>		
	Talked w/Others (n=51)	Didn't (n=60)	(p)	Talked w/Others (n=55)	Didn't (n=104)	(p)
1. Channel is among "most watched"	23%	6%	(<.006)	16%	8%	(n.s.)
2. Regularity of watching: "never"	2%	10%	(n.s.)	17%	38%	(<.001)
"several times per day/week"	75%	55%		67%	29%	

3a. Observability By Race

<u>Race</u>						
1. Black	61%	39%	(<.001)	52%	48%	(<.001)
2. White	24%	76%		17%	83%	

Table 4

Adoption At Two Time Periods By Complexity

<u>Adoption</u>	<u>Mentions Ability to Get UHF Channels</u>					
	<u>Wave 1</u>			<u>Wave 2</u>		
	<u>Yes</u> (n=123)	<u>No</u> (n=57)	(p)	<u>Yes</u> (n=252)	<u>No</u> (n=75)	(p)
1. Channel is among "most watched"	7%	5%	(n.s.)	6%	5%	(n.s.)
2. Regularity of watching: "never"	16%	23%	(<.08)	46%	59%	(<.05)
"several times per day/week"	52%	46%		30%	18%	

Mentions Ability to Get Channel 62 Specifically

	<u>Yes</u> (n=50)	<u>No</u> (n=117)		<u>Yes</u> (n=116)	<u>No</u> (n=193)	
1. Channel is among "most watched"	25%	2%	(<.001)	14%	2%	(<.001)
2. Regularity of watching: "never"	0%	20%	(<.001)	18%	67%	(<.001)
"several times per day/week"	68%	45%		57%	12%	

4a. Complexity By Race

<u>Race</u>	<u>Wave 1</u>			<u>Wave 2</u>		
	<u>UHF</u>	<u>No UHF</u>		<u>UHF</u>	<u>No UHF</u>	
1. Black	65%	35%	(n.s.)	78%	22%	(n.s.)
2. White	73%	27%		77%	23%	
	<u>Gets 62</u>	<u>Not 62</u>		<u>Gets 62</u>	<u>Not 62</u>	
1. Black	43%	57%	(<.001)	54%	46%	(<.001)
2. White	10%	90%		27%	73%	

Table 5

Adoption At Two Time Periods By Compatibility:

Personal Importance¹

<u>Adoption</u>	<u>Wave 1</u>		(p)	<u>Wave 2</u>		(p)
	<u>High</u> (n=96)	<u>Low</u> (n=162)		<u>High</u> (n=165)	<u>Low</u> (n=175)	
1. Channel is among "most watched"	18%	2%	(<.006)	13%	4%	(<.03)
2. Regularity of watching: "never"	0%	57%	(<.001)	13%	77%	(<.001)
"several times per day/week"	30%	2%		27%	0%	

5a. Compatibility By Race

<u>Race</u>						
1. Black	50%	6%	(<.001)	45%	7%	(<.001)
2. White	5%	31%		5%	39%	

¹The measure of personal importance included four response options. The statistical analysis included all four separately. For presentational use, the top and bottom response categories are illustrated here.

Table 6

Adoption At Two Time Periods By Advantages

<u>Adoption</u>	Community Need					
	<u>Wave 1</u>		(p)	<u>Wave 2</u>		(p)
	<u>Yes</u> (n=173)	<u>No</u> (n=52)		<u>Yes</u> (n=225)	<u>No</u> (n=78)	
1. Channel is among "most watched"	9%	2%	(<.10)	7%	5%	(n.s.)
2. Regularity of watching: "never"	6%	46%	(<.001)	41%	68%	(<.002)
"several times per day/week"	65%	15%		33%	11%	

6a. Advantages By Race

<u>Race</u>	<u>Needs</u>	<u>Doesn't</u>		<u>Needs</u>	<u>Doesn't</u>	
1. Black	91%	9%	(<.001)	86%	14%	(<.001)
2. White	73%	27%		67%	32%	

How Much Blacks Will Watch

	<u>A Lot</u>	<u>Not</u>		<u>A Lot</u>	<u>Not</u>	
1. Black	25%	9%	(<.004)	68%	0%	(<.03)
2. White	9%	7%		55%	5%	

How Much Whites Will Watch

	<u>A Lot</u>	<u>Not</u>		<u>A Lot</u>	<u>Not</u>	
1. Black	25%	9%	(<.005)	25%	14%	(<.005)
2. White	9%	9%		11%	9%	

Table 7
Station Adoption By Race

<u>Adoption</u>	<u>Wave 1</u>			<u>Wave 2</u>		
	<u>Blacks</u> (n=93)	<u>Whites</u> (n=107)	(p)	<u>Blacks</u> (n=132)	<u>Whites</u> (n=194)	(p)
1. Channel is among "most watched"	15%	2%	(<.001)	15%	2%	(<.001)
2. Regularity of watching:						
"never"	3%	28%		22%	65%	
"< once a week"	3%	27%		7%	15%	
"once a week"	12%	17%	(<.001)	14%	10%	(<.001)
"several times a week"	56%	25%		39%	10%	
"several times a day"	26%	4%		18%	14%	

FOOTNOTES

1. Greenberg, B.S. and Mazingo, S. "Racial Issues in Mass Media Institutions," Toward the Elimination of Racism, in P. Katz, ed., Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, 1976.
2. Greenberg, B.S. and Dervin, B. "Mass Communication Among the Urban Poor," Public Opinion Quarterly, 34:224-235, (Summer, 1970).
3. Rogers, E.M. and Shoemaker, F.F. Communication of Innovations: A Cross Cultural Approach, (New York: Free Press, 1971).
4. Ibid, p. 135.
5. Greenberg and Dervin, op. cit.